

From: Christopher Watson <cwatson@smtp.allegiant.com>
To: FCC Feedback <rm8775@fcc.gov>
Date: 4/9/96 4:43pm
Subject: DO NOT REGULATE!

Don't let the FCC go on record as being as paranoid as Congress of the Internet and all it promises. Do not regulate Internet phone services. The Internet is a free domain. Let people do what they want. Don't regulate it. Stop trying to take away our freedoms!

Christopher Watson
Webmaster
Allegiant Technologies, Inc.

RECEIVED

APR 9 1996

Mr. [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible]

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

No. of Copies rec'd _____
[illegible] ABCDE

From: Charles Craig
To: fccpo:bnguyen
Date: 4/9/96 3:33pm
Subject: AR8000 Recommendation - Forward

Forwarded message from: GCOLLAZO

APR 9 1996

APR 9 1996

APR 9 1996

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Number of Copies rec'd 1
10000

APR 9 1996

From: Darrin Smith <drs@gemini.moscomyp>
To: A16.A16(rm8775)
Date: 4/30/96 12:40pm
Subject: ACTA petition to regulate internet services

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

"ACTA submits that it is not in the public interest to permit long distance service to be given away, depriving those who must maintain the telecommunications infrastructure of the revenue to do so, and nor is it in the public interest for these select telecommunications carriers to operate outside of the regulatory requirements applicable to all other carriers."

I personally find this argument to be flawed when it is in fact the long distance carriers that are providing the lines that make up the internet to the internet service providers(ISP). If they are having such a problem with it, they can try and raise the cost of providing T1 or ISDN service to the ISP's which are supposedly stealing thier profits. As the system is now, it is the ISP's that are giving funding to the telecomm. companies for the lines required to make up the infrastructure of the internet. Because of this, there already exists a monetary compensation to take care of the cost of using the internet a a voice medium, and the proposed changes are unnecessary.

Furthermore, I believe this is just part of the evolution of communications. If the members of ACTA are so upset over thier 'loss of business' then why don't they start competing with the current technology instead of trying stop the evolution of new and better technologies? I don't believe that this group has anything to complain about since avenues of competition are already available to them.

Darrin Smith

No. of Copies rec'd
of 10000

RECEIVED

APR 9 1996

From: Tim Hopkins <tim.hopkins@natinst.com>
To: A16.A16(rm8775)
Date: 4/9/96 2:56pm
Subject: Internet Communications

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

I feel that regulating the internet is not an evil in itself. It's the type and amount of regulation that concerns me. Indiscriminant regulation chokes the transmission of ideas taht spawn the next generation of medical advances that save lives. And, yes, larger weapons of war and the dictators that use them. But legislating ours lifes from fear of those weapons is not the means to guide history. Prohibition proved that much. -- <I>God is coming, look busy</I>

No. of Copies rec'd
List ABCDE

RECEIVED

From: Peter Perla <perlap@cna.org>
To: A16.A16(rm8775)
Date: 4/9/96 1:36pm
Subject: Internet Phones

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

APR 9 1996

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
COMMUNICATIONS SECTION

I would like to add my voice to the chorus of opposition to the blatant infringement of free speech the money-greedy long-distance phone carriers are attempting to perpetrate by crushing Internet-based phone service. How typical.
Dr. Peter P. Perla

No. of Copies rec'd
List ABCDE

APR 9 1996

From: John McClary Prevost <visigoth@olivier.pc.cs.cmu.edu>
To: A16.A16(rm8775)
Date: 4/9/96 12:14pm
Subject: Support for voice via the Internet.

RECEIVED
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

I've recently come across information in news stories about the telephone industry's objections to voice transmission via the internet. There are two main arguments I've seen as to why voice communications should somehow be "disallowed" on the net (though how such a restriction should be enforced, I don't know.)

First, voice via the internet somehow competes with telephone communications.

This is true. On the internet you are not generally charged for the distance your communications travel. Instead of paying money to keep a decent stream of communication open, your communication degrades and slows down--because current internet protocols guarantee that a packet is transmitted, but they do not guarantee how long it takes a packet to arrive. This is a radically different economic model from that which the phone company bases business on. In the future, new standards will allow better voice transmissions via the net, and people will probably be able to choose between simply allowing performance to degrade based on the level of traffic or taking the more expensive route and paying money to guarantee their information reaches its destination in a certain amount of time.

In either case, I find the idea that this is unfair competition to be rather hilarious. The telephone companies and internet providers make use of the same sort of resources--they simply serve different markets. Because the internet market is currently smaller than the telephone market, the current flat-rate charges can work for service providers. As more and more people begin using the internet, service will become more expensive, or there will be more supply. Telephone companies will have to compete with the internet in either way--but I believe they should sink or swim. We have nothing to gain by keeping in use a technology that is being superceded--because the internet can carry more than just voice, and it can do it better. If the telephone companies wish to compete they should do their best to enter this -new- market.

This brings us to the second argument I've heard against voice on the net. That have people using up net bandwidth with voice communications is going to degrade the network to the point where nothing useful can get done. I find this argument laughable. Voice and video communication eat a lot of network bandwidth, it's true, but a person using a telephone line to connect to a service provider and thus the net cannot use any more bandwidth than their telephone line provides (a very small amount indeed.) And on top of that, as demand for the net increases, more and more network resources are being developed. The demand for network bandwidth will provide an economic framework by which bandwidth can be paid for--and when a carrier is paid for bandwidth, they can increase the total bandwidth available.

In any case, there is no simple way to prevent voice communication via the net. There is, in fact, probably no complex way to do it. There are a number of commercial products available which provided voice via the net, but there are also numerous free software packages to do the same. You can restrict companies from selling such products, but can you outlaw the products completely?

I think this would be very foolish.

Thank you for your time,

John Prevost,
Systems Programmer,
Carnegie Mellon University
School of Computer Science Research Facility.

30 - 1 Copies rec'd
107 AB006

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

APR 9 1996

From: Jeanne Spellman <spellmje@bc.edu>
To: A16.A16(rm8775)
Date: 4/9/96 11:58am
Subject: Internet Phone service should not be regulated

EDM: [unclear] [unclear] [unclear]
[unclear] [unclear] [unclear]

Internet phone service is an exciting new area of consumer choice and competition to telecommunications companies. It is important to consumers/voters that this field be allowed to develop without regulation that will stifle competition with traditional telecom providers.

Jeanne Spellman
533 Edmands Rd
Framingham, MA 01701

No. of Copies rec'd 1
Use ABCDE

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

From: TRENT WILLEY <twilley2@weber.edu>
To: A16.A16(rm8775)
Date: 4/9/96 11:42am
Subject: RM8775

RECEIVED

APR 9 1996

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

Protect the internet for the consumer. Reject RM8775, the ACTA Internet
Phone petition.

Trent Willey
497 W. Quail Run Rd. Farmington, Utah 84025

No. of Copies rec'd
List ABCDE

1